

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 through 33 were pending in this application, and claims 1 and 3 through 33 were rejected.

Claims 7 through 18, and 20 through 33 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6 and 19 in view of the amendments to the claims and the following arguments.

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), this rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 as amended recites a vehicular video system comprising two separate monitors that each simultaneously display different video outputs, in different locations from and independent of each other. Neither **Pala et al** nor **Lee** describe nor suggest using two separate independent video monitors in different locations to simultaneously display video outputs independent of the other. As such claim 1 is not anticipated by **Pala et al** or **Lee**.

With regard to claims 3 through 6, these claims depend on currently amended claim 1 which applicants believe to be allowable. Thus, applicants submit that claims 3 through 6 are allowable.

With regard to the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), this rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 19 as amended recites a vehicular video system comprising two separate monitors that each simultaneously display different video outputs, in different locations from and independent of each other.

Neither **Pala et al** nor **Lee** describe nor suggest using two separate independent video monitors in different locations to simultaneously display video output signals independent of the other.

Applicants also submit that it would not have been an obvious design choice to provide two separate video monitors mounted in different locations in a vehicle. For example, when the vehicle is off, the video switching mechanism could display a video output of the rear facing camera on the first video monitor to improve driver awareness, and could also display a video output on a second video monitor in response to a motion sensor alarm to improve passenger awareness and security. Applicants submit it would not have been obvious to provide two separate video monitors, which has been found to meet the interests of consumers interested in both driver awareness and improved security.

Furthermore, it is impossible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much as will support a position of obviousness, to the exclusion of the other parts of which a reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. Furthermore, the mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. *MPEP 2143.01* Neither **Pala et al** nor **Lee** suggests including two separate video monitors for the purpose of providing consumers with improved driver awareness and motion sensing alarms for improved passenger awareness. Obviousness cannot be established by combining references without also providing evidence of the motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the applicants have done. MPEP 2144 As such claim 19 is not obvious in view of **Pala et al** or **Lee**.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 34 through 39 have been added. These claims are further drawn to the non-obvious design choice to provide two separate video monitors mounted in different locations in a vehicle, such that one could display video outputs to a first video monitor to improve driver awareness and the other could display video outputs to a second video monitor in response to a motion sensor alarm to improve passenger awareness and security in the vehicle. Applicants feel that these claims are allowable and are supported in the specification.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the stated grounds of rejection of claims 1, 3-6, and 19 have been properly traversed, and that all newly added are allowable in view of the above arguments. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of these claims. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of the amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-28-04

By: Kevin Pumm
Kevin Pumm
Reg. No. 49,046

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 726-7500